

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated March 17, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the attached amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented here are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. Claims 1- 26 stand rejected. Claims 12-14 have been indicated as being allowable, but for their dependence on a rejected base claim. Applicants gratefully acknowledge and cordially thank the Examiner for indication of the same. Claims 1, 3, 7-11, 13-15, 18-21 and 24 have been amended, claims 2, 12, 17 and 26 have been canceled and claim 27 is new. Support for the amendments may be found at least in cancelled claims 2, 12, 17 and 26, FIGS. 2, 4, 7, 9 and 20, including at least pages 10, 17 and 22 of the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added by the amendment. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1, 3-11, 13-16, 18-25 and 27 based on the amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,833,668, hereinafter “Yamada”). The Examiner states that Yamada discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims, primarily in FIGS. 2C-3B. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*: a plurality of dummy light emitting patterns directly formed on the substrate in the second region. . . .

In contrast, Yamada does not describe or teach dummy light patterns.

Yamada does not teach or suggest a plurality of dummy light emitting patterns directly formed on the substrate in the second region, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claim 1 under § 102(b) be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-7, 10, 15, 17-21, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Nakanishi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0070808, hereinafter “Nakanishi”) in view of Yudasaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,380,672, hereinafter “Yudasaka”). The Examiner states that Nakanishi discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *the single second electrode being disposed directly on the insulation member*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in column 2, lines 4-12 and column 3, lines 1-9 of Yudasaka. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reasons set forth below.

As previously amended, independent claims 1, 11, 15 and 18 includes the limitation of *light emitting patterns disposed directly on the first electrodes*. This limitation is not taught or suggested in the prior art. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1, 11, 15 and 18, and claims 2-7, 10, 17, 19-21, 25 and 26 depending therefrom.

In particular, FIG. 4 of Nakanishi relied upon by the Examiner discloses a layer (25) (not described in the specification) interposed between the anode (23) and the EL layer (60). Likewise, FIG. 5, and in particular FIG. 5(b), of Nakanishi relied upon by the Examiner discloses an inorganic bank layer (221a) interposed between the anode (23) and the EL layer (60). Moreover, Yudasaka does not cure this deficiency and the Examiner merely uses Yudasaka for the alleged teaching of *the single second electrode being disposed directly on the insulation member*.

More specifically, Nakanishi and Yudasaka, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest light emitting patterns disposed directly on the first electrodes, as recited in independent claims 1 and 11, 15, and similarly claimed in amended independent claim 18. Therefore, claims 1, 11, 15 and 18, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-10, 13, 14 and 16-27, define over Nakanishi in view of Yudasaka.

Furthermore, claims 1, 15 and 18 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*: a plurality of dummy light emitting patterns directly formed on the substrate in the second region [surrounding the first region]

However, Nakanishi discloses dummy light patterns 60 (functional layer 110) formed on inorganic bank layer 221a and on dummy anode 23a in a second region 5, as illustrated in FIGS. 4 and 5. Furthermore, as discussed above with respect to the rejection to claim 1, Yamada does not describe or teach dummy light patterns.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 1-7, 10, 15, 17-21, 25 and 26 under § 103(a) be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Nakanishi in view of Yudasaka and further in view of Nagayama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,137,220, hereinafter “Nagayama”). The Examiner states that Nakanishi in view of Yudasaka discloses all of the elements of claim 8 except, *the exact angle of the inside wall of the openings*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 2a and column 5, lines 45-57 of Nagayama. The Examiner states that Nakanishi in view of Yudasaka discloses all of the elements of claim 9 except, *the second electrode includes an opaque conductive material*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily column 5, lines 57-64 of Nagayama.

First, it is respectfully noted that claims 8 and 9 depend from independent claim 1, which is respectfully submitted as being allowable for defining over Nakanishi in view of Yudasaka as discussed above. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that use of *the second electrode includes an opaque conductive material* allegedly disclosed in Nagayama does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Nakanishi.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 8 and 9 under § 103(a) be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yamada in view of Omura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,053,549, hereinafter “Omura”). The Examiner states that Yamada discloses all of the elements of claim 11 except, *the insulation*

layer having a groove, which the Examiner further state is disclosed primarily in FIG. 2 of Omura.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*: each light pattern disposed directly on a respective first electrode is substantially isolated from each of the other light patterns . . . wherein a width of the groove is equal to or more than a width of the openings.

In contrast, FIG. 3B of Yamada relied upon by the Examiner discloses a continuous light emitting layer (5) disposed on and between each of the first electrodes (4). Further, there is no insulation layer labeled or mentioned in Yamada.

Yamada does not teach or suggest each light pattern disposed directly on a respective first electrode is substantially isolated from each of the other light patterns . . . wherein a width of the groove is equal to or more than a width of the openings, as recited in amended independent claim 11. It is noted that Omura does not cure this deficiency.

Neither Yamada nor Omura, either or alone or in combination, teach or suggest each light pattern disposed directly on a respective first electrode is substantially isolated from each of the other light patterns . . . wherein a width of the groove is equal to or more than a width of the openings, as recited in amended independent claim 11.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claim 11 under § 103(a) be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks distinguishing the prior art of record, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' Attorneys at the below-listed telephone number regarding this Amendment or otherwise regarding the present application in order to address any questions or remaining issues concerning the same. If there are any charges due in connection with this response, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Registration No. 43,801
Confirmation No. 1578
Cantor Colburn LLP
20 Church Street 22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Customer No. 23413

Date: June 17, 2008